DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 533 HE 033 368

TITLE	Annual Student Remediation Report.
INSTITUTION	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma City.
PUB DATE	2000-04-07
NOTE	33p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 500 Education Building, State Capitol Complex, Oklahoma City, OK 73105.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Accountability; College Freshmen; College Students; High School Students; High Schools; Higher Education; *Remedial Instruction; *Remedial Programs; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Oklahoma

ABSTRACT

In 1991, the Oklahoma State Regents adopted the Student Assessment Policy, which required each higher education institution to develop and implement a comprehensive assessment program with mandatory student placement. This is the eighth annual student remediation report. Data are for the 1998-99 academic year. Most data were collected from the State Regents' Unitized Data System. Institutions provided information about secondary assessment for placement in college-level courses. The State Regents implemented multiple initiatives to enhance student preparation for college. Improved high school preparation positively affected students' college remediation. Two-year colleges are the primary source of remediation in the State System. Remedial education in higher education serves a large percentage of students without draining state appropriated funding. Providing remedial education in higher education benefits underprepared high school students, place-bound adult returning students, and students for whom English is a second language. Data are provided on number of students enrolled in remedial courses; first-time freshmen enrolled in remedial courses; remediation and high school core curriculum; first-time freshmen enrolled in remedial courses by subject area; first-time freshmen scoring below 19 on ACT subject tests; first-time freshmen passing secondary tests; and first-time freshmen direct from high schools. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 533

Oklahoma State System
Of
Higher Education

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY:
H. Brisch
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

April 7, 2000

HE033368

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Bill W. Burgess, Jr.
Chairman
Lawton

Leonard J. Eaton, Jr.
Vice Chairman, Tulsa

Jimmy D. Harrel
Leedy

Joe L. Mayer
Secretary, Guymon

Robert L. McCormick, Jr.
Stillwater

Joseph E. Cappy
Tulsa

John Massey
Durant

Marlin "Ike" Glass, Jr.
Newkirk

Carl R. Renfro
Ponca City

Hans Brisch
Chancellor

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in compliance with Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 11246 as amended, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and other federal laws do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, handicap, or status as a veteran in any of its policies, practices, or procedures. This includes but is not limited to admissions, employment, financial aid, and educational services.

This publication, duplicated by the State Regents' central services, is issued by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as authorized by 70 O.S. Supp. 1999, Section 3206. Copies have been prepared and distributed internally. Copies have been deposited with the Publications Clearinghouse of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT

Executive Summary i

Background 1

Oklahoma Initiatives 2

Oklahoma's Schools Improving 4

Higher Education's Role in Remediation 4

Research 5

Methodology 6

Findings 6

Conclusions 8

Tables 10

Appendix

Policy Statement on the Assessment of Students for Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability 16

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT
1998-99

Executive Summary

BACKGROUND:

- In 1991, the State Regents adopted the Student Assessment Policy that required each institution to develop and implement a comprehensive assessment program with mandatory student placement in fall 1994. This is the eighth annual student remediation report.

- Remedial education is not a recent phenomenon in higher education. As early as the 17th century, Harvard College provided remedial instruction for inadequately prepared students. In 1849, the University of Wisconsin established the first preparatory program for students with inadequate preparation. Remedial education was needed when World War II veterans came to college, and for first-generation college students who gained access to higher education due to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Today's technological environment requires lifelong learning and results in the continued need for remedial education.

OKLAHOMA INITIATIVES

1993:

- The State Regents approved *Student Competencies for College Success*, a document compiled by college faculty translating the required high school core curriculum into specific knowledge and skills.

- The State Regents set a standardized score to determine academic subject preparation for college and made remediation mandatory for underprepared students.

- The State Regents increased the high school core curricular requirements for college admission from 11 to 15 courses, effective fall 1997.

- The State Regents and ACT implemented the Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS). EPAS provides students in grades eight and ten with information about the probability of the grades that they would earn in college based on their current high school performance. This early alert system notifies high school students of specific subject areas in need of further development while they are still in high school.

1996:

- The State Regents implemented the 12 x 4 curriculum for elementary education, special education, and early childhood education majors. Students must complete 12 credit hours of coursework in each of four subjects – English, mathematics, science, and social sciences. The 12 x 4 subject matter block provides teachers stronger academic preparation and more in-depth subject knowledge.

1997:

- The State Regents implemented the Oklahoma Mathematics Preparation Initiative to focus on improving student achievement in mathematics. The Math 2001 committee, a group of Oklahoma shareholders in mathematics education, was convened to formulate recommendations to enhance student mathematics preparation.

1999:

- The State Regents initiated *Brain Gain 2010: Building Oklahoma Through Intellectual Power,* a comprehensive plan to increase the proportion of Oklahoma's population with a college degree from 25 to 38 percent by 2010. *Brain Gain 2010* strategies include enhancing student preparation for college and providing the support structure once in college to lead to graduation.

- The State Regents replaced *Student Competencies for College Success* with *Standards for Transition*, a new feedback tool that allows school districts to see a clear picture of core academic skills that students need to succeed in college. Additionally, individual students will be informed of specific areas which will enhance their preparation for college.

- The State Regents added a third option for college admission based solely on a student's GPA for the State Regents' 15-unit high school core curriculum. This option rewards rigorous high school course-taking and strengthens the State Regents' 15-unit high school curricular requirement.

OKLAHOMA'S SCHOOLS IMPROVING:

Education Week Ranking

- 1998: Oklahoma --
  - Ranked #1 (A-) in Teacher Quality
  - A- in Academic Standards and Assessment

- 1999: Oklahoma ranked #3 (A-) in Improving Teacher Quality

- 2000: Oklahoma --
  - Ranked #3 (B) in Improving Teacher Quality
  - Jumped from C- to an A- in Standards and Accountability, the most significant improvement of any state

HIGHER EDUCATION'S ROLE IN REMEDIATION:

- The current debate about remedial education incorrectly assumes that remediation is proportionately spread out among the State System institutions. In fact, over three-quarters of all remediation is conducted by community colleges.

- The remedial demands of many students are limited to one course.
  - Of the 2,439 students (unduplicated headcount) who enrolled in remedial courses at the comprehensive universities in 1998-99, 74 percent enrolled in only one course.
  - Among the regional universities, 52 percent of the 6,251 students (unduplicated headcount) enrolled in remedial courses took only one course.

- Of the 23,175 students (unduplicated headcount) who enrolled in remedial courses at a two-year college, 54 percent took only one course.

- A comprehensive view of remedial education shows that a diverse student population enrolls in remedial courses, including students from high schools without advanced mathematics or science classes; students for whom English is a second language; and working adults who are seeking new job skills for the information-based economy.

RESEARCH:

- National and regional studies report approximately one-third of new freshmen in remediation. These reports do not include science remediation.

- 40.6 percent of fall 1998 Oklahoma freshmen enrolled in remedial courses, including science remediation.

- States with mandatory remediation like Oklahoma report higher student remediation rates.

- Thus, Oklahoma remediation rates are consistent with remediation rates in national and regional studies.

- Both the SREB and Oklahoma remediation studies show that Oklahoma students enrolling in State System institutions directly from an Oklahoma high school (40 percent) are less likely to need remediation than adult students (54 percent).

FINDINGS:

Data are for the 1998-99 academic year unless otherwise noted.

- 38,609 students enrolled in remedial courses.
  - 8 percent (2,956 students) at the comprehensive universities
  - 17 percent (6,509 students) at the regional universities
  - 75 percent (29,144 students) at the two-year colleges

- Of fall 1998 first-time freshmen, 40.6 percent enrolled in remedial courses. This percentage of first-time freshmen enrolled in remedial courses is about the same as the 40.3 percent in 1996-97.

- 55 percent of freshmen who did not meet the high school core curriculum enrolled in remedial courses, compared to 30.8 percent of freshmen who completed the high school core curriculum.

- Fall 1998 freshman remediation by subject:
  - 34 percent mathematics
  - 16 percent English
  - 7 percent reading
  - 4 percent science

- From fall 1994, the percentage of freshmen with an ACT score below 19 decreased as follows:
  - English: 32.3 to 23.0 percent
  - Math: 39.3 to 28.6 percent
  - Science: 24.5 to 18.8 percent
  - Reading: 26.6 to 19.0 percent

- Adults require more remediation. During the 1998-99 academic year, a higher percentage of adult freshmen (54 percent) enrolled in remedial courses than freshmen direct from high school (41 percent).

- Students pay more for remedial courses:
  - comprehensive universities: + $24 per credit hour
  - regional universities: + $20 per credit hour
  - community colleges: + $13 per credit hour
  - technical branches: + $18.50 per credit hour

- In 1997-98, Oklahoma State System institutions generated $1.9 million from student paid remedial course fees to cover the direct costs of providing remedial courses.

CONCLUSIONS:

- The State Regents' multiple initiatives to enhance student preparation for college continue to payoff. Improved high school preparation is positively impacting student remediation in college. The percentage of students with ACT subject scores lower than 19 has declined since fall 1994.

- Students who take the State Regents' 15-unit high school core curriculum are less likely to enroll in remedial courses than students who do not.

- Two-year colleges continue to be the primary source of remediation in the State System. This is consistent with the community college's mission and the State Regents' stated goal to focus remediation at the two-year college level and reduce remediation at the comprehensive and regional universities.

- In Oklahoma, remedial education at two- and four-year colleges currently serves a large percentage of students without placing a financial drain on state appropriated funding of higher education.

- Providing remedial education at two- and four-year institutions benefits underprepared high school students, place-bound adult returning students, and students for whom English is a second language.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

ANNUAL STUDENT REMEDIATION REPORT
1998-99

INTRODUCTION:

In 1991, the State Regents adopted and implemented the *"Policy Statement on the Assessment of Students for Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability"* (II-2-117), which requires Oklahoma's public higher education institutions to administer comprehensive assessment programs. The policy was modified in 1993, with remediation made mandatory for underprepared students. The policy requires that institutions use an ACT score of 19 as the "first cut" in determining whether a student needs remediation in the ACT subject areas of English, mathematics, science reasoning, and reading. Students who score below 19 in an ACT subject area must either enroll in a remedial course or undergo secondary assessment. Students who score below the designated levels on these secondary tests must successfully complete remedial courses. This is the eighth annual student remediation report. This report describes remedial activity during the 1998-99 academic year and provides comparisons to previous years.

BACKGROUND:

Remedial education is not a recent phenomenon in higher education. As early as the 17th century, Harvard College provided remedial instruction for inadequately prepared students. In 1849, the University of Wisconsin established the first preparatory program for students with inadequate preparation in reading, writing, and arithmetic. The program remediated students so they could succeed in the university's agricultural and mechanical science degree programs. The generation of World War II veterans who entered colleges and universities on the G.I. Bill required remedial coursework to refresh their skills. Students, who for the first time gained access to higher education because of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Higher Education Act of 1965, created increased demands for remedial coursework.[1]

The apparent widespread need for college remediation of recent high school graduates has evoked concerns from policymakers, business leaders, and educators. A survey of professors, college officials, and business leaders found that all three groups agreed *"that too many students are taking remedial classes in college because of poor preparation."*[2] California, Texas, Massachusetts, and Florida have introduced policies to reduce remedial education.[3] California made the writing competency test mandatory and encourages high schools to teach reading and writing through the senior year. The California State University, where 68 percent of 1998 freshmen needed remediation, is working to reduce remediation by offering programs such as tutoring and mentoring to 233 high schools.[4]

---

[1] "College Remediation: What It Is, What It Costs, What's at Stake," Institute for Higher Education Policy, December 1998.

[2] "Differing Points of View," William Trombley, *National Crosstalk*, Winter 1999.

[3] "The Remedial Controversy: Different States Offer Various Solutions," William Trombley, William Doyle, and Jennifer Davis, *National Crosstalk*, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Summer 1998.

[4] "Cal State Reports Success in Reining in Students' Remediation Needs," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 18, 1999.

Similarly, Oklahoma has taken aggressive steps to reduce remediation by better preparing students while still in high school. Oklahoma's philosophy for improving student performance is simple and reflected in McAlester Superintendent Lucy Smith's statement, *"You expect more, you get more...[Students] are rising to meet the challenge."* [5]

The financial costs of remedial education are one of many underlying concerns. Policymakers in Virginia, Tennessee, and California have proposed making public schools pay the cost of college remedial courses taken by their graduates.[6] In Oklahoma and Wisconsin, students who require remedial courses must pay a fee for remedial courses in addition to their tuition. In the Oklahoma State System, comprehensive universities charge an additional $24 per credit hour for remedial courses, while regional universities charge $20, technical branches charge $18.50, and two-year colleges charge $13. With this fee, remedial education courses are self-supporting, because students pay the direct costs.

There is a growing body of research showing that the costs of providing remedial education are not as great as once believed. A Government Accounting Office (GAO) study of the amount of federal student loans used to pay for remedial courses in fall 1995 determined that no more than 4 percent of the financial aid granted to freshmen and sophomores paid for remedial courses.[7] The most recent accounting of remediation costs suggests that remediation consumes approximately $1 billion dollars annually out of a public higher education budget of $115 billion – less than one percent of expenditures.[8] In 1997-98, Oklahoma State System institutions generated $1.9 million from remedial course fees to cover the direct costs of providing remedial courses.

OKLAHOMA INITIATIVES:

In addition to deflecting the costs of remedial education to the underprepared student, the State Regents have undertaken multiple initiatives to reduce college remediation.

- In 1993, the State Regents adopted a three-part package to enhance high school student preparation for college. First, the State Regents approved *Student Competencies for College Success*, a document compiled by college faculty translating the required high school core curriculum into specific knowledge and skills. This publication is used to inform high school students of what they need to know to succeed as college freshmen. Second, the State Regents set a state system standardized score to determine academic subject preparation for college and made remediation mandatory for underprepared students. Finally, the State Regents increased the high school core curricular requirements from 11 to 15 courses, effective fall 1997.

- In 1993, the State Regents and ACT collaborated in the Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS). EPAS is a voluntary student assessment and instructional support program that provides feedback to high schools about their performance in preparing students for college. EPAS also provides individual students with

---

[5] "Study Praises Education Level", Diane Plumberg, *The Daily Oklahoman*, Saturday, January 8, 2000, p. 8A.

[6] Len Lazarick, Community College Times, April 6, 1999.

[7] Government Accounting Office, Federal Aid Awarded to Students Taking Remedial Courses, August 1997.

[8] David W. Breneman and William N. Haarlow, Establishing the Real Value of Remedial Education, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 9, 1999.

information about the probability of the grades that they would earn in college based on their current high school performance. This early alert system notifies high school students of specific subject areas in need of further development while they are still in high school. Currently, 69 percent of all districts participate, which represents 81 percent of all eighth grade students and 77 percent of all tenth grade students in Oklahoma. The State Regents administered EPAS at a cost of $750,000 for the 1999-2000 school year.

- In 1996, the State Regents implemented multiple teacher education initiatives designed to improve teacher preparation and thus reduce the need for college remediation of students. Among these initiatives were the implementation of the 12 x 4 curriculum for elementary education, special education, and early childhood education majors. Students enrolling in these programs must complete 12 credit hours of coursework in each of four subjects – English, mathematics, science, and social sciences. The 12 x 4 subject matter block provides teachers stronger academic preparation and more in depth knowledge of the four core subjects. Since 1992, the State Regents have required a major in an academic discipline for secondary certification.

- In response to the predominant need for remediation in mathematics, the State Regents in 1997 implemented the Oklahoma Mathematics Preparation Initiative to focus on improving student achievement in mathematics. The Math 2001 committee, a group of Oklahoma shareholders in mathematics education, was convened to formulate recommendations to enhance student mathematics preparation. Through collaboration with the Oklahoma Center for Teacher Preparation, the State Department of Education, the Oklahoma Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and others, the Math 2001 Committee expects that its efforts will yield a number of projects designed to align K-16 mathematics education, enhance professional development opportunities for teachers, and improve student achievement in mathematics.

- The State Regents initiated *Brain Gain 2010: Building Oklahoma Through Intellectual Power* in January 1999. *Brain Gain 2010* is a comprehensive plan to increase the proportion of Oklahoma's population with a college degree from 25 to 38 percent by 2010. *Brain Gain 2010* strategies include enhancing student preparation for college by recommending that high school students complete a fourth math unit for college entry; directing high schools to incorporate a writing component into English courses required for college admission; and recommending high school students take at least three lab science courses. Through enhancing student preparation for college, the State Regents will increase the number of students who go to college directly from high school, reduce remediation, and improve Oklahoma college and university graduation rates.

- In December 1999, the State Regents replaced *Student Competencies for College Success* with *Standards for Transition*, which is based on skills tested by ACT and course placement data in Oklahoma. Oklahoma is the first state to collaborate with ACT to create a new feedback tool that will allow school districts to see as early as the eighth and tenth grades a clear picture of core academic skills that students need to succeed in postsecondary education. Additionally, individual students will be informed of specific areas which will enhance their preparation for college.

- In December 1999, the State Regents added a third option for college admission. The third option is based solely on a student's GPA for the State Regents' 15-unit high

school core curriculum. This option rewards rigorous high school course-taking by incorporating a writing component in the English courses and increasing the recommended units to include an additional mathematics course and an additional lab science course. This new option provides additional weighting to the GPAs of students who take The College Board Advanced Placement (AP) and higher-level International Baccalaureate (IB) courses. The changes to the curricular requirements support the State Regents' 1999 *Brain Gain 2010* recommendations for strengthening student preparation for college. This policy also reinforces the State Department of Education's Oklahoma Advanced Placement Incentives program, which has successfully expanded AP course taking in Oklahoma.

OKLAHOMA'S SCHOOLS IMPROVING:

Oklahoma's efforts to improve the quality of its teaching force have received favorable reviews by national studies.

- In 1998, *Education Week* ranked Oklahoma ranked first in the nation for its efforts to improve the quality of its teaching force. Oklahoma received an "A minus" for its academic standards and assessment, as well as for its teaching quality.

- In 1999, Oklahoma received an "A minus" and was ranked third in the nation for its continuing efforts to improve teacher quality.

- In 2000, *Education Week* stated: *"Oklahoma's grade for standards and accountability jumped from a "C minus" to an "A minus", the most significant improvement of any state."* Once again, *Education Week* ranked Oklahoma third in the nation ("B") for its efforts to improve teacher quality.

HIGHER EDUCATION'S ROLE IN REMEDIATION:

The current debate about remedial education incorrectly assumes that remediation is proportionately spread out among the State System institutions. In fact, over three-quarters of all remediation taught in the State System during 1998-99 was conducted by community colleges. Providing remedial courses is consistent with the community college mission and the State Regents' stated goal of reducing remediation at the comprehensive and regional institutions.

Eliminating remediation at Oklahoma's public four-year institutions would be a sweeping change that would affect a significant number of students whose remedial demands are limited to a single subject – typically mathematics. Of the 2,439 students (unduplicated annual headcount) who enrolled in remedial courses at the comprehensive universities in 1998-99, 74 percent enrolled in only one course. Among the regional universities, 52 percent of the 6,251 students (unduplicated annual headcount) enrolled in remedial courses took only one course, and 54 percent of the 23,175 students (unduplicated annual headcount) enrolled in remedial courses at two-year colleges took only one course.

The demographics of remedial education show that remediation is not limited to recent high school graduates. A comprehensive view of remedial education shows that a diverse student population enrolls in remedial courses, including students from high schools without advanced mathematics or science classes; students for whom English is a second language

and; working adults who are seeking new job skills for the information-based economy. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 31 percent of entering freshmen who took a remedial class in 1992-93 were 19 years or younger, while 46 percent were over 22 years of age – the traditional age of baccalaureate degree completion.[9] Twenty-seven percent of entering freshman in remedial courses were 30 years of age or older.[10] In Oklahoma, 53 percent of adult admission freshmen enrolled in remedial courses in 1998-99, while 41.2 percent of the first-time freshmen who entered college directly from high school enrolled in remedial courses. *As higher education continues to educate an ever-growing proportion of the population, including older students returning to college, there is every reason to conclude that remediation will continue to be a function of colleges and universities,*[11] if students are to be provided the opportunity to be successful.

RESEARCH:

Three studies by the Southern Regional Education Board[12,13,14] (SREB) and two National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) studies[15,16] reported that approximately one-third of new freshmen enroll in remedial courses. However, the SREB studies found that states with mandatory assessment and placement programs, such as Oklahoma, reported higher percentages of students enrolled in remedial courses. A State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) policies study reported that at least seven states (Arkansas, Georgia, Nevada, New York, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and West Virginia) require placement of all freshmen.[17]

The Oklahoma remediation report includes science remediation, while the SREB and NCES remediation studies did not. Therefore, the higher percent of State System students enrolling in remedial courses since the State Regents' policy made remediation mandatory in 1994 is consistent with these reports. Both the SREB and Oklahoma remediation studies show that Oklahoma students enrolling in State System institutions directly from an Oklahoma high school (40.1 percent) are less likely to need remediation than adult students (53.5 percent).

The 1996 NCES study reported that 47 percent of institutions experienced no change in the number of students enrolled in remedial courses during the past five years, while 39 percent had an increase in remedial enrollment. Like Oklahoma, most of the remediation

---

[9] "Remedial Education at Higher Education Institutions in Fall 1995," National Center for Education Statistics, October 1996.

[10] Ignash, Juan M. 1997. "Who Should Provide Postsecondary Remedial/Developmental Education?" In J. Ignash, ed. *Implementing Effective Policies for Remedial and Developmental Education.* New Directions for Community Colleges No. 100.

[11] Ronald Phipps, "Universities Have Always Remediated," *The Oklahoma Observer*, April 10, 1999.

[12] "They Came to College?: A Remedial Developmental Profile of First-Time Freshmen in SREB States," Southern Regional Education Board, 1991.

[13] "Better Preparation, Less Remediation: Challenging Courses Make a Difference," Southern Regional Education Board, 1997.

[14] "Educational Benchmarks 1998," Southern Regional Education Board, July 1998.

[15] "College-Level Remedial Education in the Fall of 1989," National Center for Education Statistics, May 1991.

[16] "Remedial Education at Higher Education Institutions in Fall 1995," National Center for Education Statistics, October 1996.

[17] "Statewide Remedial Education Policies," Edward Crowe, State Higher Education Executive Officers, September 1998.

was in mathematics. From 1996-97 to 1998-99, the percentage of first-time freshmen in the State System who enrolled in remedial courses remained about the same (40.3 and 40.6 percent, respectively). The percentage increased from 21.3 to 23.0 percent at the comprehensive universities, remained the same at the regional universities (34.0 percent) and increased from 49.8 to 50.3 percent at the two-year colleges. The increased remediation at the comprehensive tier was due to an increase in the cutscore on the mathematics placement test at the University of Oklahoma.

The 1991 NCES study reported a lack of meaningful feedback from colleges to high schools regarding the academic preparation of their students. Oklahoma has taken aggressive steps to facilitate greater feedback through cooperation with the Office of Accountability's Educational Indicators Program and the State Regents' High School Indicator Project. Also, as previously mentioned, the State Regents have implemented comprehensive student feedback programs through EPAS and the *Standards for Transition*.

METHODOLOGY:

In 1991, the State Regents began collecting remediation data from institutions via annual "paper and pencil" surveys. In 1996-97, data collection was automated to reduce the number of staff hours needed to complete the surveys and to improve the reporting and tracking of remediation data. Most of the remediation data for this report were collected from the State Regents' Unitized Data System (UDS). Institutions separately provided information about secondary assessment for placement in college-level courses, because this information is not available in the UDS.

FINDINGS:

Number of Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses (Table 1)

- During the 1998-99 academic year, 38,609 students enrolled in remedial courses: 2,956 (7.7 percent) at the comprehensive universities, 6,509 (16.9 percent) at the regional universities, and 29,144 (75.5 percent) at the two-year colleges.
- Half (49.6 percent) of the enrollments in remedial courses were in the fall, 42.7 percent in the spring, and 7.6 percent in the summer.
- These students generated 52,171 remedial enrollments: 3,179 (6.1 percent) at the comprehensive universities, 8,694 (16.7 percent) at the regional universities, and 40,298 (77.2 percent) at the two-year colleges.

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses (Tables 2 and 3)

- Of the 27,182 fall 1998 first-time freshmen, 11,049 (40.6 percent) enrolled in remedial courses sometime during the 1998-99 academic year: 1,313 (23.0 percent) of the comprehensive university freshmen, 2,242 (34.0 percent) of the regional university freshmen, and 7,494 (50.3 percent) of the two-year college freshmen.
- From 1996-97 to 1998-99, the percentage of first-time freshmen enrolled in remedial courses remained about the same (40.3 and 40.6 percent, respectively) for the State System. The percentage increased from 21.3 to 23.0 percent at the comprehensive universities, remained the same at the regional universities (34.0 percent) and increased from 49.8 to 50.3 percent at the two-year colleges. The increased remediation

at the comprehensive tier was due to an increase in the cutscore on the mathematics placement test at the University of Oklahoma.

Remediation and High School Core Curriculum (Table 4)

When taking the ACT, students are asked to respond to a series of questions pertaining to their high school curriculum. This information was combined with UDS data on remedial courses to determine whether completing the State Regents' 15-unit high school core curriculum affects remedial enrollments. The 15-unit core curriculum was implemented in fall 1997. ACT data were not available for out-of-state applicants, many special non-degree seeking adult admission, or international students.

- A smaller percentage of fall 1998 first-time freshmen who met the high school core curriculum (30.8 percent) enrolled in remedial courses than freshmen who did not meet the core curriculum (55.3 percent) or those with no information (46.2 percent).
- At the comprehensive universities, 18.4 percent of those students who met the core curriculum enrolled in remediation compared to 38.0 percent of those who did not meet the core. At the regional universities, 29.5 percent who met the core curriculum enrolled in remediation compared to 54.2 percent who did not meet the core. At the two-year colleges, 43.2 percent who met the core curriculum enrolled in remediation compared to 59.8 percent who did not meet the core.

First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Subject Area (Tables 5 and 6)

- Of the 27,182 fall 1998 first-time freshmen, 34.0 percent enrolled in at least one remedial mathematics course, 16.3 percent in a remedial English course, 3.9 percent in a remedial science course, and 6.6 percent in a remedial reading course sometime during the 1998-99 academic year.
- At the comprehensive universities, 21.2 percent enrolled in a remedial mathematics course, 2.4 percent in a remedial English course, 1.6 percent in a remedial science course, and 1.8 percent in a remedial reading course.
- At the regional universities, 26.0 percent enrolled in a remedial mathematics course, 16.4 percent in a remedial English course, 5.4 percent in a remedial science course, and 8.5 percent in a remedial reading course.
- At the two-year colleges, 42.5 percent enrolled in a remedial mathematics course, 21.5 percent in a remedial English course, 4.2 percent in a remedial science course, and 7.7 percent in a remedial reading course.
- From 1996-97 to 1998-99, the percentage of first-time freshmen enrolled in remedial courses remained about the same for the State System (33.8 and 34.0 percent, respectfully) in mathematics, increased from 13.4 to 16.3 in English, remained the same (3.9 percent) in science, and increased from 4.0 to 6.6 in reading.

First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT Subject Tests (Table 7)

- From fall 1994 when remediation became mandatory to fall 1998, the percentage of first-time freshmen with an ACT subject score below 19 for the State System and all tier levels decreased from 32.3 to 23.0 percent in English, from 39.3 to 28.6 percent in mathematics, from 24.5 to 18.8 percent in science, and from 26.6 to 19.0 percent in reading.

First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests (Table 7)

- Remediation became mandatory in the State System in fall 1994. From fall 1994 to fall 1998, the percentage of students passing secondary tests decreased from 48.4 to 37.6 percent in English, from 28.1 to 14.9 percent in mathematics, from 23.0 to 15.7 percent in science, and from 38.8 to 27.2 percent in reading.

First-Time Freshmen Direct from High School (Table 8 and 9)

- During the 1998-99 academic year, 41.2 percent of the first-time freshmen who entered college directly from high school enrolled in remedial courses: 22.5 percent at the comprehensive universities, 33.0 percent at the regional universities, and 57.9 percent at the two-year colleges.
- From 1996-97 to 1998-99, the percentage of freshmen directly from high school enrolled in remedial courses increased from 37.5 to 41.2 percent for the State System, from 20.1 to 22.5 percent at the comprehensive universities, from 32.3 to 33.0 percent at the regional universities, and from 52.6 to 57.9 percent at the two-year colleges.
- In 1998-99, a lower percentage of freshmen coming directly from Oklahoma high schools (40.1 percent) enrolled in remediation compared to all freshmen (41.2 percent) direct from high school.
- As expected, a higher percentage of adult admission freshmen (53.5 percent) enrolled in remedial courses than freshmen direct from high school (41.2 percent).
- From 1996-97 to 1998-99, the percentage of transfer students enrolling in remedial courses has remained about the same (11.1 to 11.0 percent).

CONCLUSIONS:

The State Regents' multiple initiatives to enhance student preparation for college continue to payoff. Improved high school preparation is positively impacting student remediation in college. The percentage of students with ACT subject scores lower than 19 has declined since fall 1994. Students who take the State Regents' 15-unit high school core curriculum are less likely to enroll in remedial courses than students who do not.

Remediation has always been and remains a function of all higher education institutions. A significant percentage of students will continue to need remedial courses so they may succeed in college-level coursework. Although critics of remediation complain that the costs drain valuable state resources, such costs are negligible when compared to the alternatives, which can range from falling levels of degree attainment to forced employment in low paying jobs. Requiring students who are enrolled at a four-year institution to enroll concurrently at a two-year college could create additional financial and logistical obstacles, driving up student costs and possibly lengthening the time needed to attain a degree.

A recent study from the U.S. Department of Education concluded that "*Increasingly, state and local policy seeks to constrict - if not eliminate - the amount of remedial work that takes place in 4-year colleges. But there is a class of students whose deficiencies in preparation are minor and can be remediated quickly*"[18] without driving up costs or damaging degree completion rates. In Oklahoma, remedial education at two- and four-year colleges currently

[18] *Answers in the Tool Box: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor's Degree Attainment*, Clifford Adelman, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education, June 1999, page ix.

serves a large percentage of students without placing a financial drain on state appropriated funding of higher education. As previously noted, Oklahoma's remedial education courses are self-supporting; students pay the direct costs.

Providing remedial education at two- and four-year institutions benefits students, institutions, and the public. Remedial coursework enables underprepared high school students to learn the value of achievement while acquiring the skills necessary to succeed in college-level work. Remedial education benefits place-bound, adult returning students who are compelled to seek retraining at colleges and universities in their local communities, because they desire to make a better living and enhanced quality of life in the increasingly knowledge-based economy. *"The fact that it is never too late to go to college is one of the greatest strengths of American higher education."* [19]

Remedial courses benefit institutions because students who successfully complete their remedial coursework become regular attendees who pay tuition and participate in the learning community. College graduates benefit the public as a whole, resulting in a productive citizenry, an educated workforce, greater economic productivity, and increased revenues for the state. In short, continuing to *"provide effective remedial education would do more to alleviate our most serious social and economic problems than any other action we could take.*[20]

---

[19] John D. Walda, *Eliminating Remediation Has High Costs*, AGB Publications, January/February 1999, p.5.

[20] "Remedial Education and Civic Responsibility," Alexander Astin, *National Crosstalk*, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Summer 1998.

Annual Student Remediation Report

Tables

April 7, 2000

Table 1
Number of Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses
1998-99

Tier	Number of Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses					Number of Enrollments in Remedial Courses				
	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999	Total	Percent of Total	Summer 1998	Fall 1998	Spring 1999	Total	Percent of Total
Comprehensive	146	1,802	1,008	2,956	7.7%	146	2,009	1,024	3,179	6.1%
Regional	490	3,541	2,478	6,509	16.9%	551	5,020	3,123	8,694	16.7%
Two-Year	2,773	13,629	12,742	29,144	75.5%	3,286	18,862	18,150	40,298	77.2%
State System	3,409	18,972	16,228	38,609	100.0%	3,983	25,891	22,297	52,171	100.0%
Percent of State System	8.8%	49.1%	42.0%	100.0%		7.6%	49.6%	42.7%	100.0%	

Table 2
First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses
1998-99

Tier	Number of Fall 1998 First-Time Freshmen	Number Enrolled in Remedial Courses				Percent Enrolled in Remedial Courses			
		Summer 98	Fall 98	Spring 99	Total*	Summer 98	Fall 98	Spring 99	Total
Comprehensive	5,697	21	1,151	466	1,313	0.4%	20.2%	8.2%	23.0%
Regional	6,598	95	2,049	1,002	2,242	1.4%	31.1%	15.2%	34.0%
Two-Year	14,887	416	6,728	3,541	7,494	2.8%	45.2%	23.8%	50.3%
State System	27,182	532	9,928	5,009	11,049	2.0%	36.5%	18.4%	40.6%

* Unduplicated annual headcount reported, i.e. students are counted only once regardless of the number of times they enroll in remedial courses.

Table 3
First-Time Freshman Enrollments in Remedial Courses
1996-97 to 1998-99

Tier	Number of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses			Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses				
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1-Year Diff.	2-Year Diff.
Comprehensive	1,041	1,012	1,313	21.3%	19.3%	23.0%	3.7	1.7
Regional	2,205	2,125	2,242	34.0%	34.6%	34.0%	-0.6	0.0
Two-Year	7,005	6,905	7,494	49.8%	50.0%	50.3%	0.3	0.5
State System	10,251	10,042	11,049	40.3%	39.9%	40.6%	0.7	0.3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
Remediation and High School Core Curriculum
1998-99

Tier	Number of Fall 1998 First-Time Freshmen and Status of 15-Unit High School Core			Number Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Status of 15-Unit High School Core			Percent Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Status of 15-Unit High School Core		
	Did Not Meet	Met	No Info.*	Did Not Meet	Met	No Info.*	Did Not Meet	Met	No Info.*
Comprehensive	950	3,206	1,541	361	591	361	38.0%	18.4%	23.4%
Regional	1,275	2,114	1,650	691	623	928	54.2%	29.5%	56.2%
Two-Year	3,902	3,437	7,548	2,335	1,484	3,675	59.8%	43.2%	48.7%
State System	6,127	8,757	10,739	3,387	2,698	4,964	55.3%	30.8%	46.2%

* Data not provided for out-of-state, most special non-degree seeking, adult admission, or international students.

Table 5

Number and Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Subject Area

1998-99

Tier	Number of Fall 1998 First-Time Freshmen	Number* Enrolled in Remediation by Subject Area				Percent Enrolled in Remediation by Subject Area			
		English	Math	Science	Reading	English	Math	Science	Reading
Comprehensive	5,697	139	1,207	91	101	2.4%	21.2%	1.6%	1.8%
Regional	6,598	1,081	1,714	355	563	16.4%	26.0%	5.4%	8.5%
Two-Year	14,887	3,201	6,326	626	1,142	21.5%	42.5%	4.2%	7.7%
State System	27,182	4,421	9,247	1,072	1,806	16.3%	34.0%	3.9%	6.6%

Note: Some reading remediation is reported as English remediation and vice versa.

* Unduplicated annual headcount within each subject because some students enrolled in the same remedial course more than once or more than one remedial course per subject area.

Table 6

Number and Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Subject Area

1996-97 to 1998-99

Tier	Percent Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Subject Area											
	1996-97				1998-99				Difference			
	English	Math	Science	Reading	English	Math	Science	Reading	English	Math	Science	Reading
Comp	3.5%	19.2%	1.3%	0.0%	2.4%	21.2%	1.6%	1.8%	-1.1	2.0	0.3	1.8
Reg	15.8%	26.5%	5.3%	7.6%	16.4%	26.0%	5.4%	8.5%	0.6	-0.5	0.1	0.9
Two-Yr	15.8%	42.2%	4.1%	3.8%	21.5%	42.5%	4.2%	7.7%	5.7	0.3	0.1	3.9
State	13.4%	33.8%	3.9%	4.0%	16.3%	34.0%	3.9%	6.6%	2.9	0.2	0.0	2.6

Note: Some reading remediation is reported as English remediation and vice versa.

1997-98 to 1998-99

Tier	Percent Enrolled in Remedial Courses by Subject Area											
	1997-98				1998-99				Difference			
	English	Math	Science	Reading	English	Math	Science	Reading	English	Math	Science	Reading
Comp	2.8%	17.4%	1.4%	1.3%	2.4%	21.2%	1.6%	1.8%	-0.4	3.8	0.2	0.5
Reg	14.3%	28.7%	4.7%	11.4%	16.4%	26.0%	5.4%	8.5%	2.1	-2.7	0.7	-2.9
Two-Yr	24.2%	40.1%	7.8%	4.6%	21.5%	42.5%	4.2%	7.7%	-2.7	2.4	-3.6	3.1
State	17.3%	32.6%	5.7%	5.6%	16.3%	34.0%	3.9%	6.6%	-1.0	1.4	-1.8	1.0

Note: Some reading remediation is reported as English remediation and vice versa.

Table 7
First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT Subject Tests and Passing Secondary Tests
Fall 1994 to Fall 1998

English

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT					Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests				
	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98
Comprehensive	12.5%	13.6%	11.5%	8.9%	8.3%	76.9%	37.3%	36.0%	60.3%	45.7%
Regional	40.8%	34.9%	26.4%	26.0%	26.8%	43.3%	37.1%	26.8%	30.2%	28.1%
Two-Year	34.7%	28.7%	24.4%	26.3%	26.9%	47.6%	44.8%	33.2%	30.0%	40.8%
State System	32.3%	27.2%	22.4%	22.6%	23.0%	48.4%	41.9%	31.6%	32.5%	37.6%

Note: Some English remediation is reported as reading remediation and vice versa.

Mathematics

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT					Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests				
	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98
Comprehensive	17.6%	18.0%	13.7%	12.7%	12.5%	36.9%	29.2%	21.2%	18.8%	27.7%
Regional	52.6%	47.9%	33.4%	33.5%	34.3%	22.8%	31.2%	22.4%	26.9%	19.9%
Two-Year	40.7%	33.4%	28.1%	30.7%	32.2%	29.3%	20.9%	12.5%	9.4%	10.7%
State System	39.3%	33.7%	26.7%	27.7%	28.6%	28.1%	25.0%	16.5%	15.4%	14.9%

Science

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT					Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests				
	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98
Comprehensive	9.7%	9.6%	7.4%	6.9%	6.1%	74.8%	32.5%	27.7%	33.9%	13.8%
Regional	28.4%	29.6%	20.0%	20.0%	21.4%	12.0%	9.8%	16.4%	14.8%	14.8%
Two-Year	27.1%	22.1%	19.5%	20.7%	22.6%	21.9%	12.5%	12.6%	12.5%	16.2%
State System	24.5%	21.4%	17.3%	17.7%	18.8%	23.0%	13.4%	15.0%	14.9%	15.7%

Reading

Tier	Percent of First-Time Freshmen Scoring Below 19 on ACT					Percent of First-Time Freshmen Passing Secondary Tests				
	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98
Comprehensive	9.7%	10.1%	9.4%	7.1%	6.9%	63.4%	39.1%	48.7%	48.9%	39.4%
Regional	33.2%	27.0%	21.3%	20.4%	20.9%	24.3%	26.3%	23.6%	25.8%	22.7%
Two-Year	28.9%	21.7%	20.6%	21.3%	22.8%	41.9%	44.2%	33.0%	32.4%	27.6%
State System	26.6%	20.7%	18.6%	18.1%	19.0%	38.8%	38.5%	31.8%	31.9%	27.2%

Note: Some reading remediation is reported as English remediation and vice versa.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8
Student Enrollments in Remedial Courses by Type of Admission
1996-97 to 1998-99

First-Time Freshmen Direct from All High Schools*

Tier	Number of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses			Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses				
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1-Year Diff.	2-Year Diff.
Comprehensive	903	872	1,204	20.1%	18.1%	22.5%	4.4	2.4
Regional	1,598	1,472	1,767	32.3%	31.7%	33.0%	1.3	0.7
Two-Year	3,622	3,831	5,047	52.6%	52.5%	57.9%	5.4	5.3
State System	6,123	6,175	8,018	37.5%	36.9%	41.2%	4.3	3.7

First-Time Freshmen Direct from Oklahoma High Schools*

Tier	Number of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses			Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses				
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1-Year Diff.	2-Year Diff.
Comprehensive	778	724	973	21.0%	18.5%	22.7%	4.2	1.7
Regional	1,461	1,297	1,443	32.5%	31.3%	31.9%	0.6	-0.6
Two-Year	3,481	3,750	4,162	50.9%	50.6%	54.9%	4.3	4.0
State System	5,720	5,771	6,578	37.3%	37.3%	40.1%	2.8	2.8

* New freshmen who are 17, 18, or 19 years old are defined as direct from high school.

Table 9
Student Enrollments in Remedial Courses by Type of Admission
1996-97 to 1998-99

Adult Admission First-Time Freshmen

Tier	Number of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses			Percent of First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Remedial Courses				
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1-Year Diff.	2-Year Diff.
Comprehensive	n/a	79	66	n/a	64.8%	66.7%	1.9	n/a
Regional	n/a	357	360	n/a	54.5%	49.8%	-4.7	n/a
Two-Year	n/a	1,163	986	n/a	64.2%	54.3%	-9.9	n/a
State System	n/a	1,599	1,412	n/a	61.8%	53.5%	-8.3	n/a

Tranfer Students

Tier	Number of Transfer Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses			Percent of Transfer Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses				
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1-Year Diff.	2-Year Diff.
Comprehensive	266	264	241	7.8%	7.3%	7.1%	-0.2	-0.7
Regional	330	368	320	6.1%	6.9%	6.9%	0.0	0.8
Two-Year	822	1,040	763	20.6%	18.0%	19.3%	1.3	-1.3
State System	1,418	1,672	1,324	11.1%	11.4%	11.0%	-0.4	-0.1

Annual Student Remediation Report

Appendix

April 7, 2000

Appendix A

POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS FOR PURPOSES OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT AND STATE SYSTEM ACCOUNTABILITY

The Constitution of Oklahoma charges the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education with responsibility for prescribing standards for admission, retention, and graduation applicable to each institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. The State Regents also have the responsibility to provide leadership in the coordination of the orderly transfer of students between and among institutions of the State System. Inherent in such responsibilities is the prescribing of mechanisms to monitor and facilitate the assessment of students for purposes of instructional improvement and State System accountability.

Statement of Accountability:

Accountability to the citizens of Oklahoma within a tax-supported educational system is of paramount importance. The public has both the need and right to know that their tax dollars are being used wisely, and most importantly, producing tangible, measurable outcomes of learning for individual students enrolled within the State System. Improvement in student learning and on-going faculty development, measurable through assessment programs, are achievable and essential outcomes, and the responsibility of the State System to the public.

Definition and Purpose:

Assess: The original definition of *assess* was *to sit down beside*. The term has evolved to mean careful evaluation based on the kind of close observation that comes from *sitting down beside*.[1] Such a definition captures the desired relationship between teacher and student and the spirit of the following policy statement.

For purposes of this policy, student assessment in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is defined as *a multi-dimensional evaluative process that measures the overall educational impact of the college/university experience on students and provides information for making program improvements.*

Assessment is not an end in and of itself. Similarly, to document performance is not necessarily to improve performance. Thus the purpose of assessment is to **maximize student success** through the assessment process by the systematic gathering, interpretation, and use of information about student learning/achievement to improve instruction. The results of assessment contribute to and are an integral part of the institution's strategic planning and program review process to improve teaching and learning. As previously noted, it also is one mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of the State's System of Higher Education. Finally, student assessment is designed to contribute to assuring the integrity of college degrees, and other educational activities/goals, to increasing the retention and graduate rates of college students, to enhancing the quality of campus life in general, and to encouraging high school students to improve their academic preparation for college.

---

[1] ***Assessment at Alverno College*** **by the Alverno College Faculty, page 1.**

Institutional Requirements

Each college and university shall assess individual student performance in achieving its programmatic objectives. Specifically, each institution will develop criteria, subject to State Regents' approval, for the evaluation of students at college entry to determine academic preparation and course placement; mid-level assessment to determine basic skill competencies; exit assessment to evaluate the outcomes in the student's major; and student perception of program quality including satisfaction with support services, academic curriculum, and the faculty. Such evaluation criteria must be tied to stated program outcomes and learner competencies.

In recognition of varying institutional missions and clientele served, such assessment components will be campus based under the leadership of the local faculty and administrators providing that the procedures meet the requirements detailed in the following sections. Assessment programs should consider the needs of special populations in the development of policies and procedures. Finally, as institutions develop criteria and select assessment mechanisms, each program component should be coordinated and complement the whole.

Entry Level Assessment and Placement

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist institutional faculties and counselors in making decisions that will give students the best possible chance of success in attaining their academic goals. Each institution will use an established ACT score in the four subject areas of science reasoning, mathematics, reading, and English as the "first cut" in determining individual student readiness for college level course work.[2] Should a student score below the level, s/he will be required to remediate in the discipline area or, consistent with institution's approved assessment plan, undergo additional testing to determine his/her level of readiness for college level work. Similarly, institutions may, within their approved assessment plans, establish higher standards by requiring additional testing of those students meeting or exceeding the minimum ACT subject test score requirement. These subject test score requirements will be communicated to college bound students, parents, and common schools for the purpose of informing them of the levels of proficiency in the basic skills areas needed to be adequately prepared for college level work. Additionally, these ACT subscores provide a standard yardstick for measuring student readiness across the State System.

For high school students wishing to enroll concurrently in college courses the established ACT score[2] in the four subject areas will apply as follows: A high school student not meeting the designated score in science reasoning, mathematics, and English will not be permitted enrollment in the corresponding college subject area. A student scoring below the established ACT score in reading will not be permitted enrollment in any other collegiate course (outside the subjects of science, mathematics, and English).

Institutional entry level assessment programs should include an evaluation of past academic performance, educational readiness (such as mental, physical, and

[2] The appropriate subject tests level for each subject area (one system score for each subject area) will be set by the State Regents following staff work with ACT staff and the Council on Instruction. Implementation of this requirement will be fall 1994. Students admitted under the Special Adult Admission provision may be exempt from this requirement.

emotional), educational goals, study skills, values, self-concept and motivation. Student assessment results will be utilized in the placement and advisement process to ensure that students enroll in courses appropriate for their skill levels. Tracking systems should be implemented to ensure that information from assessment and completion of course work is used to evaluate and strengthen programs in order to further enhance student achievement and development. The data collection activities should be clearly linked to instructional improvement efforts.

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents in the following format:

1. the number of students participating in entry-level assessment and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. the number of students requiring additional basic skills development by area;
3. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
4. the methodologies (courses, tutoring, etc.) by which students were required to participate in the improvement of basic skills.

The tracking of these students in future semesters is expected.

Mid-Level Assessment

Generally, mid-level assessment competencies are gained through the student's general education program. Thus, the results of mid-level assessment should be used to improve the institution's program of general education. Assessment at mid-level is designed to assess the student's academic progress and learning competencies in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking.

Mid-level assessments will normally occur after the student has completed forty-five semester hours and prior to the completion of seventy semester hours for students in baccalaureate programs. For associate degree programs assessments may occur at mid-level or at the end of the degree program.

Examples of appropriate measures include academic standing, GPA, standardized and institutionally developed instruments, portfolios, etc.

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents as follows:

1. the number of students assessed and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
3. detailed plans for any instructional changes due to the assessment results.

The tracking of these students in future semesters is expected.

Program Outcomes Assessment

Program Outcomes Assessment, or major field of study assessment, is the third component of the State Regents' policy. Such assessments should be designed to measure how well students are meeting institutionally stated program goals and objectives.

As with other levels of assessment, selection of the assessment instruments and other parameters (such as target groups, when testing occurs, etc.) is the responsibility of the institution subject to State Regents' approval as previously specified. Preference should be given to nationally standardized instruments. The following criteria are guidelines for the section of assessment methodologies:

a) Instrument(s) should reflect the curriculum for the major and measure skills and abilities identified in the program goals and objectives;
b) Instrument(s) should assess higher level thinking skills in applying learned information; and
c) Instrument(s) should be demonstrated to be reliable and valid.

Nationally normed instruments required for graduate or professional study, or those that serve as prerequisites to practice in the profession, may be included as appropriate assessment devices. Examples are the GRE (Graduate Record Exam), NTE (National Teacher Exam), and various licensing examinations.

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents as follows:

1. the number of students assessed and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
3. detailed plans for any instructional changes due to the assessment results.

Assessment of Student Satisfaction

Perceptions of students and alumni are important in the evaluation of and the enhancement of academic and campus programs and services. Such perceptions are valuable because they provide an indication of the students' subjective view of events and services, which collectively constitute their undergraduate experiences. Evaluations of student satisfaction can be accomplished via surveys, interviews, etc. Resulting data are to be used to provide feedback for the improvement of programs and services.

Examples of programs/activities to be included in this level of assessment are satisfaction with student services, quality of food services, access to financial aid, residence hall facilities, day care, parking, etc.

Annual Reporting Requirements

Aggregate data will be reported annually to the State Regents as follows:

1. the number of students assessed and the assessment results including a frequency distribution;
2. a summary and explanation of the assessment results; and
3. detailed plans for any instructional changes due to the assessment results.

Graduate Student Assessment:

Higher education institutions that charge their graduate students the student assessment fee must perform assessment beyond the standard requirements for admission to and graduation from a graduate program. An institution that charges the assessment fee will include a description of graduate student assessment and assessment fee usage in its institutional assessment plan. Graduate student assessment results will be included in the institution's annual assessment report to the State Regents. In addition to the annual reporting requirements described above, graduate programs should attempt to present instrument data that compare graduate student performance with statewide or national norms.

The institution's plan for graduate student assessment will explain each graduate program's assessment process, including stages of assessment, descriptions of instruments used, methods of data collection, the relationship of data analysis to program improvement, and the administrative organization used to develop and review the assessment plan. Emphasis should be placed on assessing student learning and evaluating student satisfaction with instruction and services. The institution will adopt or develop assessment instruments that augment pre-assessment fee instruments (i.e. grade transcripts, Graduate Record Exams, course grades, and comprehensive exams). Departmental pre-tests, capstone experiences, cohort tracking, portfolios, interviews, and postgraduate surveys are some commonly used assessment methods.

Adopted October 4, 1991. Revised April 15, 1994, and June 28, 1996.